



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/807,974	03/24/2004	Charles C. Hart	A-3124-AL	6970
21378 7590 01/07/2009 APPLIED MEDICAL RESOURCES CORPORATION 22872 Avenida Empresa Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688				
EXAMINER				
MEHTA, BHISMA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3767				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/07/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/807,974

Applicant(s)

HART ET AL.

Examiner

BHISMA MEHTA

Art Unit

3767

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 October 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-72 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-19, 27-33 and 39-72 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 20-26 and 34-38 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 October 2008 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings were received on October 7 2008. These drawings are acceptable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

3. Claims 1-9, 20-24, and 34-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lafontaine (U.S. Patent No. 6,520,939). Lafontaine disclose a surgical access device having an elongate tubular member (110), a septum seal (140) formed at the distal end of the tubular member, and a zero seal (130) disposed at the distal end of the tubular member and distal to the septum seal. The zero seal is coupled to the septum seal and has properties to float with the septum seal relative to the tubular member. As to claim 2, see lines 5-20 of column 3. As to claims 3 and 4, the zero seal is a duckbill seal with an intersecting sealing portion (134A) or a double duckbill seal with two or more intersecting sealing portions (134B). As to claims 5 and 6, see Figure 3. As to claims 7-9, see lines 6-22 of column 4. The device also has a placement device (14, 40, 50). As to claim 21, the placement device is an obturator. As to claim 22, the placement device includes an elongate shaft with a proximal end, a mid-portion,

and a distal end. As to claim 23, the proximal end of the elongate shaft has a handle and the mid-portion of the elongate shaft has a reduced profile (see Figure 1). As to claim 34, the seal has opposing lip portions (132) separated by a slit portion. As to claims 35 and 36, see lines 31-46 of column 4. As to claims 37 and 38, the lip portions are capable of allowing a surgical item such as a surgical suture to extend through the slit portion without disrupting a seal formed by the closure of the opposing lip portions.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lafontaine in view of Green et al (U.S. Patent 6,497,716). Lafontaine discloses the device substantially as claimed. However, Lafontaine is silent on the specifics of the distal end of the placement device being shaped like an hourglass or comprising a tapered, cone-shaped member. Green et al disclose a placement device (22) which is used to place an access device (14) where the distal end of the placement device is shaped like an hourglass and has a tapered, cone-shaped member. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the placement device of Lafontaine with the placement device of Green et al as both Lafontaine and Green et al disclose surgical access devices and placement

devices for placing the access devices and Green et al disclose that it is well known to use a placement device having a distal end shaped like an hourglass and a tapered, cone-shaped member to place the access device.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the withdrawal of claims 53-72 filed October 7 2008 have been fully considered but the arguments are not persuasive. Claims 53-72 are drawn to a device having a seal at the distal end of the tubular member where the seal is sized and configured to form a seal with an instrument when an instrument is in place within the working channel of the tubular member. In the cited portions of the specification which describe the elected species (Species A – Figures 6-10), there is no disclosure of a seal being sized and configured to form a seal with an instrument when an instrument is in place within the working channel of the tubular member. There is disclosure that a large instrument substantially fills the lumen of the device and substantially deforms the first seal and the second seal. This is not considered to be disclosure of a seal being sized and configured to form a seal with an instrument when an instrument is in place within the working channel. Furthermore, there is disclosure of the first seal as comprising a septum that is sized and configured to seal in conjunction with a specific range of usable instruments. However, this is not considered to be disclosure of a seal sized and configured to form a seal with an instrument when an instrument is in place within the working channel and to form a zero

seal when no instrument is in place within the working channel of the tubular member because the septum has not been disclosed as forming a zero seal.

7. Applicant's arguments filed October 7 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments in lines 1-5 of page 29 are not deemed persuasive as the Lafontaine disclose a septum seal (140) formed at the distal end of the tubular member (110). The septum seal of Lafontaine meets the structural limitations of the claimed septum seal. Furthermore, Applicant's arguments in lines 5-14 of page 29 are not persuasive because the gasket configurations of Figures 2A and 2B and the related description of these figures have not been used as a basis for the rejection. The septum seal of Lafontaine as seen in Figure 5A and 5B is the claimed septum seal.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BHISMA MEHTA whose telephone number is (571)272-3383. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 7:30 am to 3:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Simons can be reached on 571-272-4965. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Bhisma Mehta/
Examiner, Art Unit 3767
/Kevin C. Simons/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3767